

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 remain for consideration and are thought to be allowable over the cited art.

The rejection of claims 12 – 15 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is respectfully traversed. The basis for rejecting these claims is use of “driver identifier” where this specific phrase is not used in the written description. It is respectfully noted, however, that the written description references a “designation of the driver”, which is thought to be reasonably clear to those skilled in the art as teaching a driver identifier. Thus, no amendment is thought to be necessary for purposes of patentability. However, claims 12 and 15 are amended solely for purposes of expediting prosecution, and example supporting written description may be found in paragraphs [0023] and [0027].

Claims 1 – 15 as amended are not understood to be anticipated by “Chang” (U.S. Patent No. 6,477,611 to Chang). Chang does not appear to teach that both the devices include PLDs that are configurable to implement an interface between the two devices. Therefore, Chang does not teach all of the limitations of the claims and does not anticipate claims 1-15.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and a notice of allowance are respectfully requested in view of the Amendments and Remarks presented above. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned is invited.

Respectfully submitted,



Justin Liu
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 51,959
(408) 879-4641

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 1, 2005.

Julie Matthews
Name


(Signature)